

Remarks

This is in response to the Office Action mailed April 9, 2003. As set forth above, the Applicants have requested certain amendments to the claims. These amendments are believed proper and supported by the specification. The status of the claims now pending in the Application is:

<u>Claim</u>	<u>Status</u>
6. (Currently Amended)	Independent.
16. (Original)	Independent.
17. (Original)	Depends from claim 16.
18. (Original)	Depends from claim 17.
19. (Original)	Depends from claim 16.
20. (Original)	Depends from claim 16.
21. (Original)	Depends from claim 16.
22. (Original)	Depends from claim 16.
23. (Original)	Depends from claim 16.
24. (Original)	Depends from claim 16.
25. (Original)	Depends from claim 20.
26. (Original)	Depends from claim 20.
27. (Original)	Depends from claim 20.
28. (Original)	Depends from claim 20.
29. (Original)	Depends from claim 20.
30. (Currently Amended)	Independent.
31. (Original)	Depends from claim 30.
32. (Original)	Depends from claim 30.
33. (Original)	Depends from claim 30.
34. (Original)	Depends from claim 30.
35. (Original)	Depends from claim 34.
36. (Original)	Depends from claim 16.
37. (Original)	Depends from claim 37.

Claims 1-5 and 7-15

In the Office Action mailed April 9, 2003, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 7-15 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 in view of United States Patent No. 5,989,296 issued to Patton et al. In response, the Applicants have cancelled claims 1-5 and 7-15.

Claims 6 and 30-37

In the Office Action mailed April 9, 2003, the Examiner objected to the patentability of claims 6 and 30-37 as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but noted that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base and any intervening claims. In response, the Applicant amended claim 6 to include all of the limitations of independent claim 1.

Claim 30 (a process claim) previously depended from claims 12, 11, 6 and 1 (apparatus claims). The Applicants have attempted to integrate the limitations of claims 12, 11, 6 and 1 into claim 30. The Examiner will note, however, that the limitations of claims 12, 11, 6 and 1 have not been reproduced verbatim in amended claim 30.

In the Office Action mailed April 9, 2003, the Examiner indicated that claims 16-29 were allowed in view of the prior art patents of record. The Applicants have not amended claims 16-29.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments requested herein are fully supported by the specification, do not introduce new matter and advance the prosecution of the present application. Any questions regarding this response should be addressed to the undersigned attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Phillip L. Free, Jr., Registration No. 38,143
David M. Sullivan, Registration No. 51,025
Crowe & Dunlevy, P.C.
1800 Mid-America Tower
20 North Broadway
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102-8273
Telephone: (405) 235-7700
Facsimile: (405) 239-6651